

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
) **No. 3:09-cr-00240-23**
 v.)
)
PATRICK SCOTT)
)

ORDER

Pending before the Court are Defendant Patrick Scott's motions to adopt pretrial motions filed by Defendants Omega Harris and Anthony Johnson (Doc. Nos. 1029, 1159, 1150). Specifically, Defendant Scott requests to join Defendant Harris's Motion for Severance of Counts and For a Speedy Trial and Memorandum in Support ("First Motion") (Doc. Nos. 413-14), filed on February 18. (Doc. No. 1029.) Defendant Harris's First Motion is currently pending before the Court with regard to the issue of severance of counts but was denied with regard to the issue of speedy trial on March 24, 2011. (Doc. No. 460.) Defendant Scott also requests to join Defendant Harris's Motion to Dismiss the Eighth Superseding indictment for violation of Speedy Trial Act Rights and Memorandum in Support ("Second Motion") (Doc. Nos. 1104-05), filed on May 21, 2012. (Doc. No. 1159.) Defendant Harris's Second Motion is currently pending before the Court. Finally, Defendant Scott requests to join the following motions filed by Defendant Johnson, all filed on June 8, 2012: Motion for Pretrial Notice of Government's Intent to Use 404(b) Evidence (Doc. No. 1126); Motion for Pretrial Notice of Government's Intent to Use 608 or 609 Impeachment Evidence (Doc. No. 1127); Motion for Pretrial Notice of Government's Intent to Use Evidence (Doc. No. 1128); Motion to Compel Disclosure of the Existence and Substance of Promises of Immunity, Leniency, or Preferred Treatment and Memorandum in Support (Doc. Nos. 1129-30); and Motion for Pretrial Disclosure

of Witness List and Jencks Material and Memorandum in Support (Doc. Nos. 1131-32). (Doc. No. 1150.) Defendant Johnson's above-named motions are all currently pending before the Court.

The arguments made by Defendants Harris and Johnson in their motions apply equally to Defendant Scott. (*See* Doc. Nos. 413-14, 1104-05, 1126-32). Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Defendant's motions to adopt with respect to the above-named motions filed by Defendants Harris and Johnson, with the exception of the issue of speedy trial in Defendant Harris's First Motion. (Doc. Nos. 413-14, 1104-05, 1126-32).

It is so ORDERED.

Entered this the 2nd day of October, 2012.



JOHN T. NIXON, SENIOR JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT